REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of January 27, 2005. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, and 14. Consequently, claims 1-23 remain pending in the present Application.

This application is under Final Rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the use of the cache. Claim 1 previously recited that the message publishing agent is coupled to the message cache, but did not have proper antecedent basis for the term "the message cache". Applicant has also amended claims 7 and 14 to harmonize the claims with independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to claims 1, 7, and 14 do not necessitate a new search. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 14 to recite that the cache is a local cache for the page builder tool. Support for the amendment can be found in Figures 2 and 3, item 106 and page 5, lines 10-12. Applicant also notes that in a Preliminary Amendment filed on August 2, 2001, Applicant mislabeled claim 4 as claim 5 when amending the claims. Consequently, Applicant has included the amendments made in the above-identified Preliminary Amendment to claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,546,387 (Triggs). The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 10, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in light of Triggs in view of U.S. Application Publication No. US 2002/0138582 (Chandra). The

Examiner also rejected claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being

unpatentable over Triggs in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,825 (Underwood).

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14,

15, 16, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Triggs. In response to Applicant's

arguments, the Examiner stated that "[c]aching is broadly interpreted as storing information in a

memory unit for immediate use, where a server stored information for immediate use . . ." The

Examiner also stated that "Applicant argues that Triggs does not teach storing and retrieving.

Examiner disagrees. Triggs teaches gathering content, informati[o]n collection agents for gathering

information (col. 4, lines 60 ...) from the web, by retrieving them from the respective web sites."

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Independent claim 1 recites a

message caching agent for receiving a message. Independent claim 1 further recites the use of "a

message cache coupled to the message caching agent for storing the message, the message cache

receiving the message from the message caching agent, the message cache being a local cache for

the page builder tool . . ." Claim 1 also recites the use of a message publishing agent coupled to

the message cache and the page builder tool. The message publishing agent retrieves the

message from the message cache and allows the message to be published on a web browser

through the page builder tool. Claims 7 and 14 recite analogous method and computer-readable

medium claims.

Thus, using the system, method, and computer-readable medium recited in claims 1, 7,

and 14, the message is received from a user via a message caching agent and provided to a

message cache that is local to the page builder tool. Moreover, using a message publishing

agent, the messages are retrieved from the message cache and published on a web browser

through a page builder tool. As a result, messages can be published using a conventional page

builder tool. Specification, page 6, lines 1-2. Moreover, in some embodiments, the messages

can be published, and updated, with out requiring that the entire web page be refreshed.

Specification, page 6, lines 13-15. The type of request that results in the message being

published may also be integrated into the web page. Specification, age 6, lines 16-17.

Consequently, publishing of messages is facilitated.

In contrast to the system, method and computer readable medium recited in claims 1, 7, and

14, Triggs describes a system that does not use a message caching agent to store the message to a

message cache that is a local to and coupled to a page builder tool. Similarly, Triggs neither teaches

nor suggests retrieving a message from the local message cache and publish the message through

the page builder tool.

Triggs describes a system for managing information on a computer network. Triggs,

Abstract. With respect to claims 1, 7, and 14, the Examiner cited an email reader (item 114 of Fig.

2 of Triggs) as corresponding to the recited message caching agent and the web builder (item 150 of

Fig. 4 of Triggs). However, as described in Triggs, the email reader monitors email accounts and if

the appropriate messages are available, posts the messages to a server. Triggs, col. 5, lines 54-57.

To post the message to the server, however, the email reader apparently provides the message to the

server, *which may perform further processing on the message*. Triggs, col. 8, lines 18-22. Thus,

the email reader of Triggs does not use a message caching agent to store a message in the local

cache. Further, Triggs does not teach or suggest the local message cache. Instead, the email reader

merely posts the message to a server. Consequently, Triggs fails to teach or suggest the recited use

of the message caching agent to store the message in a cache local to the page builder tool.

Furthermore, because the email reader simply uploads the message to a server, there is no

apparently need for the message to be retrieved from the message cache using a message publishing

agent prior to the message being published. Thus, Triggs also fails to teach or suggest the use of the recited message publishing agent. Consequently, for the above-identified reasons, Triggs fails to teach or suggest the system, method and computer-readable medium recited in claims 1, 7, and 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 14 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objection to claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21. Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21 depend upon independent claim 1, 7, or 14. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21 are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 10, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in light of Triggs in view of Chandra.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection. Claims 3, 10, and 17 depend upon independent claims 1, 7, and 14. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 3, 10, and 17. In particular, Triggs fails to teach or suggest the use of a message caching agent for storing a message in a local cache for the page builder tool, or retrieve the message from the local cache using a message publishing agent. Chandra fails to remedy these defects of Triggs. Chandra teaches the use of a servlet. However, the cited portions of Chandra fail to mention the use of a message publishing (or other) agent in conjunction with a page builder tool or storing a message to and retrieving the message from a local cache. Consequently, Chandra fails to remedy the defects of Triggs. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 10, and 17 are allowable as presented.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Triggs in view of Underwood. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 depend upon independent claims 1, 7, and 14. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23. In particular, Triggs fails to teach or suggest the use of a message caching agent for storing a message in a cache coupled to the page builder tool, or a message publishing agent for retrieving the message from the cache to publish the message through the page builder tool. Underwood fails to remedy these defects of Triggs. Underwood does teach the use of a Web Definer. However, the cited portions of Underwood fail to mention the use of a message publishing (or other) agent in conjunction with a page builder tool or storing a message to and retrieving the message from a cache coupled to the page builder tool. Consequently, Underwood fails to remedy the defects of Triggs. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, and 23 are allowable as presented.

Furthermore, claims 4, 11, and 18 are separately allowable over the cited references. Claims 4, 11, and 18 recite a system, method, and computer-readable medium, respectively, that uses a message publishing macro definition, coupled to the page builder tool. Claims 4, 11, and 18 further recite that the message publishing macro definition is processed by the page builder tool in response to a request from the web browser and triggers publishing of the message in response to processing of the message publishing macro definition by the page builder tool.

Triggs in view of Underwood also fails to teach or suggest the use of the message publishing macro definition. The web builder of Triggs can be used by "employees [that] may wish to publish information as a web site . . ." Triggs, col. 8, lines 50-52. In order for the information to get published, the once the web site is built using the web builder, the "information

is uploaded to the holding server, transferred to the web server, placed in the correct system category, . . ." and the appropriate employees notified of the new content. Triggs, col. 8, lines 62-65. Thus, the web builder of Triggs does not publish the message in response to processing of the message publishing macro definition. The cited portion of Underwood, particularly col. 5, lines 37-67, describe the processing of a particular macro within a document, that corresponds to forwarding a message to the DXC. Applicant respectfully submits that the processing of a particular macro that forwards a message to a component does not correspond to the recited message publishing macro definition that triggers the publishing a message in response to a request from a browser. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 11, and 18 are separately allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

___April 19, 2005___   /Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Date   Janyce R. Mitchell
                                  Reg. No. 40,095
                                  Attorney for Applicant(s)
                                  (650) 493-4540